

# THE PEOPLE'S JOURNAL.

VOL. 6--NO. 7.

PICKENS, S. C., THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1896.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

## The General Assembly.

### THE COLLEGE AND CITADEL.

A Narrow Escape from Reduction in the Appropriations.

In the House, Mr. L. J. Williams moved to make the South Carolina College appropriation \$20,000 instead of \$25,000. The ayes and noes were demanded on a motion to table this amendment, which was lost by a vote of 58 to 27.

Mr. Patton said it was unfortunate that these fights were renewed year after year. He was only prodding the gentleman from Edgefield a little with his own pitchfork when he referred to the continued fights.

Mr. Patton said the only thing was that the appropriation bill was to cover a period of 14 months. That was way \$25,000 was in there. To cut this to \$20,000 was to take the institution from the plane on which the Governor and other State officers and all other State concerns were placed. At the South Carolina College over one-half of the students were farmers' sons. Clemson was given \$100,000 to do as she pleased with. There were 300 students there. At the South Carolina College there were 183 students, and only \$25,000 was asked. Clemson was given \$114,000 this year. When she got on her feet what would begin to pull her down? He hoped Clemson and all these colleges would be given every cent they needed for current expenses. The professors had taught two months for nothing so far. The contract was there. Were they going to repudiate their contract? He didn't think so. He said to the Governor \$6,000 for the other contract? He did not care to enter into the merits of the college. Behind it, but do not starve it to death. Mr. Starke said he had voted to cut the appropriation down, but since learning that the amount was for 14 months, he was willing to give the college \$25,000.

Mr. L. J. Williams contrasted the expenses of the maintenance of the denominational colleges with those of the South Carolina College. The South Carolina College professors were being paid about four times as much as the professors of the denominational colleges for the amount of work done.

Mr. Thomas explained the position of the committee. The committee first thought it best to take last year's figures, which would have given \$29,000. The committee had finally, however, made a cut of 30 per cent against the protest of a number of the members. He then proceeded to make an earnest plea for the college.

Mr. Pollock said it seemed to him that there were some members there determined to starve the college. He came up. He spoke very earnestly in behalf of the college.

Mr. Ellerbe said that it was simply absolutely impossible to run the South Carolina College on \$20,000. They had to run the State Normal College, the professors decent salaries or they would leave.

A direct vote was then taken on Mr. Williams' amendment, and it was killed by the following vote: Ayes—Ashley, Blackwell, Bowman, Bramlett, Brown, Caughman, Connor, J. B. Finklea, Fowler, Goodwin, Hammett, Harvey, Holloway, Hough, Ilderton, Leverette, Miles, Miesow, Moore, Murray, McHenry, McHenry, Fricke, Rowland, Tatum, Thompson, Todd, Thurmond, Warr, Watson, Whitmore, Williams, L. J., Williams, Fred, Wolf—34.

Nays—Adams, Bacon, Barkley, Brezina, Brezina, Hays, Carroll, Carruthers, Cooper, Crum, Devoreux, Duthage, Eads, Earle, Elder, Ellerbe, Gadsden, Garris, Grady, Hardy, Harper, Hiott, Hollis, Hunter, Humphrey, Johnston, Kennedy, Leese, Love, McNeill, Manning, Mohr, O'Neil, Mellett, Mitchell, J. P., McKeown, McLaughlin, J. P., Patton, Phillips, Plockers, Pollock, Price, Pyatt, Rainsford, Robertson, Saunders, J. G., Shuman, Skinner, Turkle, Thomas, Townsend, Tyler, Wallace, Welch, Wilcox, Williams, T. S., Williamson, Wilson, Wyche, Wyman—63.

Mr. L. J. Williams moved to make the appropriation for the Citadel Academy \$15,000 instead of \$21,000. The State, he said, had sixty-eight beneficiaries there, making \$285 each. If denominational educational institutions can educate a boy by an amount 31 times less, why should the State pay more?

Mr. Otis moved to strike out \$15,000 and insert \$18,000.

Mr. Williams moved to table this, which was rejected by a large majority.

Mr. Thomas, in speaking on the matter, alluded to the fact that there were two extra months to be considered and that most of the money had been spent in the subsistence of the cadets. If the appropriation is not put at \$21,000, it would simply result in the closing of the institution two months earlier than usual. Only \$5,400 of the appropriation went to salaries, the rest going to the support of the beneficiaries and other necessary expenses. He spoke of the glorious record of the institution, and appealed to members not to cripple the institution.

Mr. Williams said that he found that sentiment governed the House—that is, sentiment and women—they always win. He did not think the members could justify themselves in the course they had adopted.

Mr. Ilderton said that if the House refused to cut the South Carolina College, why should the House cut down the Citadel? He proposed to vote for the Citadel appropriation as a matter of justice, to keep it on the same plane as other institutions. He did not propose to slam into the teeth of the people of Charleston that one institution should be supported and the other cut down.

Mr. Crum said the friends of the poor man seemed to be cutting his throat. This institution was the only one in the State where a poor boy could go absolutely without a cent and get an education, and its graduates were doing a grand work. It was run on the most economical plan, and he would be compelled to vote for the appropriation.

Mr. Warr said he couldn't under-

stand how one institution could get \$174,000 (Clemson) and another couldn't get anything.

Mr. Garris said the ways and means committee had sought to reach the lowest possible figure to run the institution, and he believed the institution would receive magnanimous treatment in view of the fact that every other institution in the State was north of Columbia. The battle for this institution was made several days ago and it was sustained, and he could not consent to see it cut down by a meagre appropriation. It is run on less than denominational institutions.

Mr. Harper hoped that \$21,000 would be voted, and he called for the previous question.

Mr. Williams accepted Mr. Otis' amendment and the ayes and noes were demanded on the question, resulting in the rejection of the amendment by a vote of 67 to 32.

### BUYING THE STATE EXHIBIT.

Governor Evans Will Not Have to Pay for the State's Display at the Atlanta Exposition.

The House had under consideration the appropriation of \$6,000 for the State's display at the Atlanta Exposition. The greatest questions of interest was in reference to the \$6,000 for reimbursing the outlay for the Atlanta Exposition. Judge Townsend moved to amend as follows:

"For the sum of \$6,000 be appropriated to pay J. G. Evans for certain exhibits for the use of the State, the same having been placed on exhibition at the late exposition at Atlanta."

Mr. Ilderton offered the following substitute:

"For the purchase of the exhibit of the resources of South Carolina, made at Atlanta and to be forwarded to the Cotton States Exposition to be held in the city of Chicago, Ill., \$6,000, if so much be necessary."

Mr. Townsend spoke at length on the matter. He pictured the beauties of the Atlanta Exposition, told of the necessity for a State exhibit which caused Governor Evans to get it up, and said that the exhibition at Atlanta marked an epoch in the history of South Carolina. He said that the Attorney General had rendered an opinion that the appropriation would be constitutional. They should take the Attorney General's opinion.

He then denied that the Governor's action was in usurpation of the functions of the General Assembly. He said that the Governor had given the State Fair an appropriation, that the State Fair was not a State exhibit, and that it was inconsistent in doing this. To give it to the fair would be a donation to a private purpose. This was expending money for a purpose other than a private purpose. Mr. Clark, the chairman of the finance committee, had written a letter saying it was worth \$6,000. They should look at this matter in a broad statesmanlike manner.

Mr. Ilderton did not expect to make any speech, but he felt that he should make his position plain. The constitution of 1868 forbade the mixing of the three branches of the government. This body alone was given the power to make appropriations. This body refused to make this appropriation—upon a preliminary canvass. Now they were under the new constitution, and it forbade the validation of the contract invalid under the old constitution. We are now asked to pay the money not authorized by law. Mr. Williams said that all his sentiments in this matter were in favor of giving this money, but he could not vote for it. He wanted to have such measures introduced, but no committee would do it. He understood that they would not because they said it would be a slap in the face of the administration. The house had been slapped in the face; had been taken by the throat; and pants and set over their force against their will. The Attorney General had filed an opinion; he would refrain from discussing that opinion.

Mr. Ilderton then given the matter considerable thought. It was in his mind whether they could do this or not. There was no authority for the executive appropriation. They could only buy the exhibit for its cash value. They should have such an exhibit, but they should have been done—rightly or wrongly; he thought that they should make the purchase for its actual value. The only way to get out of the middle was to let both parties.

Mr. Skinner was in favor of the appropriation. There was no misunderstanding between Governor Evans and the Legislature. Last year money was appropriated for the purpose, hence the appropriation was not made. There was no legal or constitutional question involved.

Mr. Williams—Why, then, was a joint resolution passed to purchase the exhibit? Mr. Williams—Well, isn't this a purchase of property you are now trying to make? (Laughter.)

Mr. Skinner continued to urge the necessity which rested upon the Governor in the matter, and of his having to come to the rescue of the State at a most critical juncture. He made a historical reference to Napoleon at the battle of Waterloo.

Mr. Watson said this was simply a proposition to pay for the State's exhibit at the Exposition—something that the people got the benefit of. It was not an appropriation to benefit John G. Evans at all. The law of the State was at stake. In the past few weeks men were coming to the State as a result of the exhibit at Atlanta. He wanted the appropriation made if there was only \$100 worth of exhibit remaining to the State. Mr. Watson said: "We are the law-making power of South Carolina, and we have a right to make this appropriation."

Mr. Thurmond said that the proposition was clearly constitutional. If they had passed a preliminary resolution that would have made no difference, as they could not give themselves more power than they already had. He read an extract from a long letter from Mr.

W. A. Clark, of the finance committee, stating that the exhibit was worth the \$6,000 asked.

Mr. Blackwell wanted to know what the cost of the exhibit was. He wanted to know if it was not stated in Mr. Clark's letter that a large number of the exhibits were contributed.

Mr. Thurmond answered that the contributions were given to the Governor, and not to the State. He said there could be no constitutional question.

Mr. Tatum was heretofore against the appropriation, but was now in favor of it.

Mr. Blackwell was opposed to paying the money, not because he was opposed to the Governor, or because of any constitutional question, but he did not want the precedent established of making any executive appropriations. It was not right and nothing could make it right. The Governor he did not wish to see suffer, but the Governor must take the consequences of his own act. If it was the sentiment of the people why didn't the people send him the money to pay the bill? The representatives of the people had refused to give the money.

Mr. Patton said that he could not vote for this appropriation. He had not changed his opinion as to the constitutionality of the appropriation. He regarded himself as oath-bound not to vote for this appropriation. It was simply this: That they could not appropriate to pay any back claim not authorized by law; they were the judges of the way the people's money should be spent. Mr. Patton, when he heard Mr. Ilderton's amendment read, said that it was perfectly constitutional. He wanted to know how much of the exhibit was the State's property already.

Mr. Townsend then accepted Mr. Ilderton's amendment and the previous question was thereupon called. The amendment was adopted.

Mr. Hammett offered an amendment that hereafter no claim should be paid unless specially authorized by law. This was ruled out of order. The \$6,000 appropriation was then clinched.

### THE DISPENSARY AMENDMENT.

The House Refuses to Pass the Law to Restrict the Sale of Liquor.

The bill to amend the Dispensary law by restricting the sale of liquor only for medicinal, scientific, medicinal or sacramental purposes, was next read. The bill is that introduced by Mr. Whitmore. It doesn't restrict the Temperance Union. Mr. Tatum moved to strike out the enacting words. Mr. Whitmore said the bill did not antagonize the Dispensary law, but simply wanted to take out the profit and beverage features. We don't need members of this House were elected on a strict prohibition platform. At the time the law was enacted it was understood that its purpose was to lessen the evils of drink. We don't need Dispensary money for schools. We don't want any blood money. We were told it was but a step towards prohibition and it was now the time to take the next step. The Liquor Commission's report all through calls for facilities for selling liquor. That isn't what we want. Every citizen is a partner in this business and he for one didn't want to be in it. He had been informed too that the law was not being enforced.

Mr. Hough said that he would sustain the bill to the best of his ability. It was simply a question of right or wrong. He was in favor of the sale of whiskey for medicinal purposes. He had voted against it. If there was no profit in the Dispensary, would you keep it up? If you take the profit out it wouldn't last three months. With the same strength and same force the Dispensary has prohibited could be enforced much better than the Dispensary system. It is not right from a moral standpoint. Who do you bleed to get your revenue? The poor unfortunate women and children of South Carolina. This was the last speech he would ever make, and he wanted the last words he uttered here to be for prohibition. We had passed a prohibition law but it went out of this House a white cat and came back a black cat.

Mr. Johnson of Pickens said he felt that he would be untrue to "his God and conscience" did not he raise his voice in defense of this measure. Our people by a large majority in 1892 declared for prohibition and representation was sent to Congress. They enacted into effect, but instead they enacted the Dispensary law. He then believed that it was but a step towards prohibition. Since coming to Columbia and seeing what he has seen he has come to the conclusion that the law is what the people believed it would be. He saw crowds drinking, drunk and cursing on the streets. The law has been so lax in its enforcement that soon it will be little better than the Dispensary system. What is the difference between a blind tiger and a Dispensary backed up by the State when a man can walk in, buy whiskey without signing any pledge or being asked any questions? Another alarming feature is the responsibility thrown around the Dispensaries. Men go in now and buy whiskey who never did so before, because it was a disgrace to go into a barroom and buy whiskey. We have a question before us that not only endangers the lives and welfare of our people, but threatens the salvation of their eternal souls. Governor Evans and all the other bright lights have failed to solve this question; therefore turn it over to the Christian people of this State.

Mr. Blackwell said that he did not believe that the people had voted for prohibition in 1892, as it has been construed on this floor. He did not believe that today the sentiment of the State favored the total abolition of whiskey, because prohibition or no prohibition four-fifths of the people are going to have whiskey. He asked Mr. Johnson if he had done his duty in not reporting the violation of the law he had seen in Columbia.

Mr. Johnson said he had reported it to the Governor.

Mr. Blackwell went on to say that the Dispensary law had been a great success. It is a stepping stone to pro-

hibition, but that will not come until the present generation arrives at manhood. It was the best whiskey law we ever had, and he wanted to let good enough alone.

Mr. L. J. Williams said the prohibitionists took no heed of expediency but wanted to take the people by the throat and make them stop. The barkeeper joins him because he knows success means either open barrooms or open blind tigers. If you pull a green watermelon and eat it you will get sick.

Mr. Pickens said that enough had been said to show the expediency of passing this bill. He spoke in favor of straight prohibition, holding that it was the only correct solution of the question. It is said prohibition does not prohibit, but neither does the law against murder, or arson or burglary prevent these crimes being committed.

Mr. Watson said he had been watching this question for a number of years. In 1894 the Legislature had enacted prohibition in several counties and almost the whole thing is lost. There was not actually any prohibition in them. He had watched the Dispensary law also, and he could testify that there has been no little drunkenness in the State. It is the best law we ever had and it is the duty of every Christian to see that all violators of it are brought to justice. No honest man can deny that it is an improvement on the old barroom law.

Mr. Warr started off by asking whether the Dispensary law had not been abused. Judge Townsend said he had probably had more to do with the law than any other man, and he would say that it isn't abused.

Mr. Warr. "Then my eyes fool me mighty bad. Last Sunday I saw Dispensary No. 10, in Charleston, open." He went on to argue that the bill should be amended and these abuses remedied. He said that the Dispensary law had not been abused.

Mr. Warr. "Then my eyes fool me mighty bad. Last Sunday I saw Dispensary No. 10, in Charleston, open." He went on to argue that the bill should be amended and these abuses remedied. He said that the Dispensary law had not been abused.

The ayes and noes were demanded on the motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill, which resulted in the rejection of the bill by a vote of 63 to 23.

Those who voted for the bill are: Ashley, Bacon, Bramlett, Duthage, Gadsden, Hough, Johnson, Lovett, L. J. Williams, Manning, McHenry, Mellett, McKeown, McLaughlin, Mellett, Sanders, Saunders, Warr, Whitmore, Williamson, Wilson.

### LEGISLATIVE NEWS AND NOTES.

Various Matters in the Progress of Events Likely to Go Through.

The following summary of legislation on various topics, as the session is drawing to a close, will give an idea of what is likely to become laws:

REDUCING PASSENGER RATES. In the Senate Mr. Mayfield moved to take up the bill fixing railroad rates for transportation of passengers, which was done. The bill makes first class fare 3 cents per mile, and 2-1/2 cents for second class.

Mr. Buist moved the adoption of the unfavorable report.

Mr. Norris moved to table this motion.

Mr. Buist said he had taken some pains to look into this matter and he was convinced this measure would do a hardship on many railroads. He did not want to do his whole duty as a citizen and as a representative of the people. He read a number of figures which he said were absolutely correct. He said that the bill would do this is not the time to reduce the fare.

Mr. Norris appreciated very full the excellent service the railroads are giving the people. He said some of these roads charge 3 1/4 in North Carolina and 3 in Georgia. In South Carolina we must pay 34 cents a mile. He said it was an open question whether the increased travel, when cheap rates prevailed, would not bring more money to the roads than the present rates.

Mr. Sloan said the committee at first reported favorably on the bill but after the railroads had been heard, the committee were convinced that the roads were losing money, therefore they recommended the unfavorable report.

He had become convinced we should let this thing alone and let the commissioners settle the question.

Mr. Mayfield said he hoped the unfavorable report would not be adopted. He answered the argument that North Carolina gives cheaper fare because the sections are more densely settled. He said the roads went through 3 and 3 in Georgia and South Carolina. He favored making it a uniform rate of 3 cents a mile.

Mr. Watson agreed with the senior Senator in this matter. He was fully convinced that the roads were losing money, therefore they recommended the unfavorable report.

Mr. Finley had heard these arguments for six years, but had never been convinced that the railroads were losing money, therefore he recommended the unfavorable report.

He said the roads were already carrying passengers for 2 1/4 cents a mile, as shown by the issuance of 1,000 mile tickets.

Mr. Finley said it is argued that the railroad commissioners can manage this question—but they have not been doing it. He moved to lay Mr. Buist's motion on the table. This was withdrawn and the vote taken directly on the adoption of the unfavorable report.

The vote resulted as follows: Ayes—Barnwell, Buist, Dennis, Douglas, Edd, Mauldin, Miller, Moses, Mower, Sloan, Stripling, Verdir, Williams—14.

Nays—Archer, Barton, Derham, DuBois, Finley, Fuller, Harrison, Jordan, Mayfield, McCalla, McLaniel, Norris, O'Dell, Tagin, Stackhouse—15.

Mr. Sloan said he was in favor of the bill to amend the law providing for the selection of a public printer and to regulate the awarding of contracts for public printing.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit to sell these articles will be introduced. It is a number of widows who will be entitled to pensions would have to wait

a whole year before they received any benefit.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the difficulty could be obviated by saying "first Monday in April or as soon thereafter as possible." Judge Townsend moved to make it read "on the first Monday in April after the year 1896."

This was agreed to and the effect is to allow all pensioners to obtain the benefits of the appropriation this year. Mr. Fred Williams offered an amendment to strike out all requirements as to income. If any soldier had an income he worked for it.

Mr. Thomas interrupting Mr. L. J. Williams, asked whether it was the speaker's idea that even if a man had \$20,000 or \$100,000 he should also receive a pension.

Mr. McSweney moved to amend so as to allow the widow who is 55 years old to receive a pension, instead of 60 years as the bill provided. This was voted down by a large majority.

The bill provides for pensions of \$4, \$6 and \$8 a month each.

All soldiers, and widows of soldiers, over 60 years of age, who are not entitled to a pension, but who are enjoying an annual gross income of \$100 from any source get \$4 a month.

All old soldiers and sailors who have lost one arm or one leg, or who received other bodily injury whereby they have become disabled, will get \$6 a month.

All old soldiers and sailors shall be exempt from road duty and the payment of any commutation tax. This act become effective on July 30, 1896.

### THE STATE FAIR AGAIN.

Mr. Patton then offered a substitute for the paragraph making the appropriation of \$2,500 for the State fair, which was the same as that introduced a few days ago except that it changed the amount to \$2,400.

Mr. Ashley moved to table it. He hoped it would be done, too, without any talk.

Mr. Patton explained the broad scope of the amendment, which was simply to give the money for premiums.

Mr. Ilderton was against the amendment, speaking vigorously against it. The House should not undo its action already taken.

Mr. Blackwell made an earnest appeal to the House to make this appropriation. He took the House to task pretty severely for reversing its action and paying the \$6,000 for the Atlanta exposition in the morning. Where was the consistency?

The roll call was demanded, and on a direct vote the House agreed to the amendment by a vote of 51 to 41.

Mr. Otis moved to adjourn.

Mr. Sturkie said the object of this motion to adjourn was to defeat the appropriation thus made.

Mr. Patton moved to put on the clincher. The ayes and noes were demanded. The bill was carried by a vote of 52 to 45.

THE INSURANCE BILL. The insurance bill then came up and Mr. McCalla moved concurrence in the House amendments.

Mr. Barnwell asked that the Senate insist upon its amendments, urging that it could not damage or weaken the bill, and was due in the Senate from Richmond and Charleston that their cities be excepted if they desired. It would only affect those places and he hoped they would be allowed to be excepted if they desired it.

Mr. Finley did not think the large cities should be exempted from a general law.

Mr. Sloan agreed with Mr. Barnwell and argued that the cities be allowed to exemption if they thought it best for them.

Mr. McCalla urged that the insurance men would reduce the rates in the cities and used that as an argument against the law in the State at large. He was opposed to exempting certain sections from the provisions of a general law and insisted upon his motion to concur in the House amendments. The roll then being called the bill was carried in by a vote of 15 to 14, as follows:

Yeas—Archer, Barton, Brier, DuBois, Finley, Fuller, Harrison, Jordan, Mayfield, McCalla, McLaniel, Norris, O'Dell, Tagin, Stackhouse—15.

Nays—Barnwell, Buist, Dennis, Derham, Douglas, Edd, Mauldin, Miller, Moses, Mower, Sloan, Stripling, Verdir, Williams—14.

PASSED BY THE HOUSE. The following bills were read the third time and ordered to be sent to the Senate:

A bill to authorize to provide for the payment of the expenses of the penitentiary investigation. A bill to provide for the incorporation of towns of less than one thousand and nor more than 5,000.

A bill to authorize all cities and towns to build, equip and operate a system of water works and electric lights, and to issue bonds to meet the cost of same.

A bill to authorize and empower the city of Laurens to issue bonds to the amount of three thousand five hundred dollars for the purpose of taking up bonds of said city which will become due in 1896.

A joint resolution to authorize and require the State Treasurer to repay money borrowed under a Convention ordinance.

A bill to render it punishable under certain conditions in certain localities to fail to have a lawful fence.

A bill to amend Sections 939, 940, 950 and 951 of the Revised Statutes of 1893, relating to pensions.

A bill relating to the adoption of children.

A bill to incorporate the Epworth Orphanage.

A bill to amend the law providing for the selection of a public printer and to regulate the awarding of contracts for public printing.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.

The bill to require manufacturers and dealers in tobacco, cigars and cigarettes to obtain a special permit.